

REMARKS

This Amendment and Response is filed in reply to the Office action dated August 2, 2006. This Amendment and Response amends claims 1, 12, 22-28 and 36-37, and cancels claim 29. Accordingly, after entry of this Amendment and Response, claims 1-28 and 30-42 will be pending.

I. Claim Objections

Claims 12, 17 and 35 are objected to because of informalities. Specifically, in claim 12 the word “course” should be replaced with the word “coarse” and in claims 17 and 35 the word “about” should be deleted because the term would render the claim indefinite. In response, the claims have been amended, as suggested by the Examiner, to correct the informalities.

II. Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-16, 18-28, 30-34 and 36-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 7,149,991 to Kovacs-Birkas et al. (hereinafter “Kovacs-Birkas”). An anticipation rejection requires that each and every claim limitation of a claim be disclosed in a single prior art reference.

Initially, the rejection of independent claims 1, 12, 22, 30 and 37 is addressed. The independent claims have been amended to clarify that the same circuit path of a design is measured by the first timing model and the second timing model to compute a correction factor for the first timing model. Specifically, claims 1 and 22 have been amended to include the limitations “obtaining a first estimated timing response of a first circuit path of a circuit block design using a first timing model” and “obtaining a second estimated timing response of the first circuit path of the same circuit block design using a second timing model.” Independent claims 12, 30 and 37 have been amended to include similar limitations.

It is respectfully submitted that Kovacs-Birkas does not disclose the above recited limitations. Kovacs-Birkas discloses a method for correlating the timing targets of design tools used during different phases of the design process (*see Kovacs-Birkas*, column 4, lines 51-52). As such, the circuit path measured by each tool is not the same. In the front end of the design phase only lumped estimated parasitics are available for the circuit path. In later design phases more accurate, distributed parasitics are available (*see Kovacs-Birkas*, column 6, lines 26-28). That is, a circuit path at the front end of the design differs from the circuit path at the final phase of the design process. Kovacs-Birkas does not disclose measurement of the same circuit path using two different timing models during a particular design phase. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Kovacs-Birkas does not measure

the same timing path using two different timing models as required by independent claims 1, 12, 22, 30 and 37.

Accordingly, Kovacs-Birkas does not disclose all of the limitations of the independent claims. For at least the above cited reason, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1, 12, 22, 30 and 37 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kovacs-Birkas, and such indication is respectfully requested.

The remaining rejected claims 2-11, 13-21, 23-28, 31-36 and 38-42 all depend, either directly or indirectly, from one of independent claims 1, 22, 30 and 37. Accordingly, these claims are themselves patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) over Kovacs-Birkas for at least the reasons set forth above, and such indication is respectfully requested. This statement is made without reference to or waiving the independent bases of patentability within each dependent claim.

III. Allowable Subject Matter

The Examiner is thanked for the indication that claims 17 and 35 would be allowable if written in independent form, including all the limitations of the base claims and any intervening claims. These claims have not been amended herein to be written in independent form. For the above discussed reasons with regard to independent claims 12 and 30, from which claims 17 and 35 depend, it is believed that all claims are in form for allowance and such indication is respectfully requested. Applicant reserves the right to amend claims 17 and 35 in independent form at a later date.

IV. Conclusion

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for his thorough review of the application. The Applicant respectfully submits the present application, as amended, is in condition for allowance and respectfully requests the issuance of a Notice of Allowability as soon as practicable.

The Applicant believes no fees or petitions are due with this filing. However, should any such fees or petitions be required, please consider this a request therefor and authorization to charge Deposit Account No. 04-1415 as necessary.

If the Examiner should require any additional information or amendment, please contact the undersigned attorney.

Dated: July 23, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Gregory P. Durbin", written over a horizontal line.

Gregory P. Durbin, Registration No. 42,503
Attorney for Applicant
USPTO Customer No. 66083

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Republic Plaza Building, Suite 4700
370 Seventeenth Street
Denver, Colorado 80202-5647
Phone: (303) 629-3400
Fax: (303) 629-3450